DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 451 32 EA 003 678

AUTHOR Lange, Drexel D.; And Others
TITLE Iowa Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1970 (School Year 1969-70): Title I of Public Law 89-10 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines.
PUB DATE Dec 70
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Iowa

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence and (2) applicable supplementary or background information. Data were collected from the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, and State ESEA Title I personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (EA)

ED053451

1270P-461T1

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IOWA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1970

(School Year 1969-70)

Title I of Public Law 89-10
The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, December, 1970

FISCAL
YEAR
1970
SCHOOL
YEAR
1969-70

EA 003 678

ED053451

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

DR. JAMES M. WALTER	Ames (President)
MRS. VIRGIL E. SHEPARD	Allison (Vice-President)
STANLEY R. BARBER	Wellman
ROBERT J. BEECHER	Creston
MRS. RICHARD G. COLE	Decorah
T. J. HERONIMUS	Grundy Center
MRS. EARL G. SIEVERS	Avoca
JOHN E. van der LINDEN	Sibley

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Administration

PAUL F. JOHNSTON	Superintendent of Public Instruction and Executive Officer of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel	Administrative Assistant
RICHARD N. SMITH	Deputy State Superintendent

Prepared by:

Title I Unit
Pupil Personnel Services Branch
Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
Dr. Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Title I
James F. Bottenfield, Program Evaluator, Title I

IOWA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1970

TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 89-10

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Basic State Statistics	1
II.	Project Monitoring	4
III.	Changes in SEA Procedures	6
IV.	Effect Upon Education Achievement	8
V.	Effect of Title I on Administrative Structure	17
VI.	Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged	19
VII.	Title I in Non-Public Schools	21
VIII.	Teacher Aides in Title I	22
IX.	Parent and Community Involvement in Title I Projects	2

Supplementary Material: Dubuque
Spencer
Audubon
Forest City

IOWA STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1970

I. BASIC STATE STATISTICS

A. In Iowa there were four hundred fifty-three (453) public schools and three hundred twelve (312) non-public schools in operation during the fiscal year covered by this report.

B. There were four hundred forty-seven (447) participating LEA's with the number of projects breaking down to four hundred thirty-six (436) LEA's having localized projects and twenty-seven (27) LEA's handling cooperative projects for a total of four hundred sixty-three (463) approved projects.

This report is based upon four hundred forty-two (442) evaluation reports from the LEA's for a 95.4% evaluation return.

The time placement for the Title I projects were:

1. During the regular school term only - 340 LEA's
2. During the summer term only - 14 LEA's
3. During both the regular school term and the summer term - 109 LEA's

C. There were twelve hundred twenty-nine (1,229) Title I activities for the educationally deprived children, which averages out to 2.7 activities per LEA. The activities

in alphabetical order are as follows:

Activity (curricular)	Number of LEA's	Children Participating
Art	11	845
Business Ed.	42	778
Cultural Enrich.	15	1,660
English Lang. Arts	61	4,928
Home Economics	4	42
Industrial Arts	41	1,130
Kindergarten	9	250
Mathematics	114	6,130
Music	5	163
Phys. Ed/Recreation	17	29,726
Pre-Kindergarten	23	870
Reading	445	38,330
Refresher-Review Short Term Course Studies	30	1,751
Science	20	877
Social Studies	7	264
Special Edu. for Handicapped (not including speech therapy)	52	1,671
Speech Therapy	7	726
Teacher aides and other sub-professional help	55	8,670
Vocational (other than business)	12	1,065
Work Study	16	1,291
Other	26	3,521

Activities con't.

Activities (Service)		
Attendance Services	2	216
Curriculum Materials Center Services	17	4,244
Food Services - Breakfast	1	16
Food Services - Lunch	5	290
Food Services - Other	2	198
Guidance and Counseling	29	4,191
Health Services	98	24,439
In-Service Training for Title I Staff	9	3,192
Library Services	28	6,670
Psychological Services	3	808
School Social Work Services	6	1,149
Services and Instruction for Parents	1	87
Transportation Services	3	44
Tutoring and After School Study Center	9	425
Other Services	1	3

In summation, there were 36 activity or service areas for 1,229 activities serving 165,159 children. This computes out to a State average of 1.4 activities for the unduplicated count of 114,084 Title I children.

D. The unduplicated count of Title I children who participated in Title I activities is:

(1) Public School - 102,777

(2) Non-public Schools - 11,307

This computes to a State average of 15.5% of the public school children enrolled in Title I activities and 14.1% of the non-public school children enrolled in Title I activities. The non-public school figure would be larger except that in many of the summer school activities, the non-public school children were included in the total public school count, as the non-public schools were not operational at that time of the year.

II. PROJECT MONITORING

During the 1969-1970 school year there were a total of two hundred sixty-eight (268) school visits by one or more of the six professional Title I personnel. The categorical breakdown as to the visitation objectives were:

1. Helping the LEA's in planning activities - 18%
2. Helping the LEA's in program development - 12.2%
3. Monitoring the LEA's program operation - 40.3%
4. Evaluating the LEA's program - 29.5%

A further breakdown of this information shows that forty-eight (48) LEA's were given assistance in various stages of planning program activities. There were thirty-three (33) LEA's that were visited to assist them in developing their program activities. There were one hundred eight (108) LEA's who received visits for the purpose of monitoring the operation of their program activities. There were seventy-nine (79) LEA's who received an overall evaluative visit of

their program activities.

In many instances, minor corrective suggestions were made which strengthened particular activities. In a few instances major corrective measures were taken which altered or terminated practices which were not in the entire spirit of Title I concepts. It is the opinion of this writer that these major corrections were due to misconceptions concerning the operational phase of Title I activities rather than any deliberate attempts to thwart the spirit and intent of the program.

The tabulation of responses from the LEA's in their evaluation report to the SEA substantiates the close rapport between the educational agencies.

Item #15:

Check as many of the sources of assistance received in planning and implementing this Title I project as apply.

[118] 1. Neighboring local education agencies.

[156] 2. County education agency.

[48] 3. College or university personnel.

[138] 4. Community Action Agency.

[49] 5. Commercial companies.

[434] 6. Department of Public Instruction.

[20] 7. Other governmental agencies.

Item #16:

Check as many of the statements that apply to the extent of the LEA's participation in services offered by the Department of Public Instruction.

[222] 1. LEA had contact with one or more members of Special Education, Career Education, and Curriculum Divisions concerning Title I program.

[106] 2. Staff attended reading workshop in Creston in March, 1970 or attended in-service meetings in reading coordinated by Mrs. Martin during January, February, March, April or May, 1970.

[27] 3. Staff attended regional attendance workshop held September, October, 1969.

[124] 4. LEA was visited by one or more members of the State Title I Staff.

[265] 5. LEA's staff made one or more visits to Des Moines to confer with members of the State Title I staff.

[408] 6. The publication, Submitting a Title I Project, provided assistance.

[266] 7. The publication, Iowa's Focus on the Title I Child - 1968, was helpful.

[348] 8. Communicated by telephone with State Title I staff concerning Fiscal Year 1970 project.

[360] 9. Attended area meeting where presentation was made by members of State Title I staff, October, November, 1969; January, February, March, 1970.

III. CHANGES IN SEA PROCEDURES

A. The Title I section of the Department of Public Instruction, by free exchange of ideas during staff meetings, is constantly seeking for ways to improve the quality of the Title I programs. Through eight regional meetings with administrators of the LEA's

the concept of "comparability" was explained with the ramifications involved; "teacher aides" was another segment of the meeting, and changes and refinements were discussed with the LEA administrators; another section of the meeting handled the problem of "slow learners" with suggestions presented by personnel from an LEA that was doing a good job in this area; another section of the meeting handled an innovative summer school approach with the LEA personnel presenting this program. During the general meeting of the groups, the administrative handling of Title I was discussed.

B. To insure proper participation of non-public school children, a routine cross-check was made at the time of application. If an LEA has a non-public school within it's boundaries, the application must contain program activities for non-public school children or a signed, dated statement from the non-public school administrator that they do not wish to participate. During the school year the non-public schools are included in the visitations to the LEA's and their participation is evaluated. At the end of the Title I activity year, the SEA evaluation form requires reporting concerning the non-public school activity. This is also routinely cross-checked at the State level when the evaluation reports are received.

There is also a non-public advisory committee composed of non-public school administrators. There are scheduled meetings with Department personnel to clarify Title I concepts and to seek solutions to problems that may be present or contemplated.

C. At the time of the visits by the SEA to the LEA, the strong and weak points of their Title I programs are assessed. Constructive criticism is given and if it appears that Federal guidelines are not being followed, then more stringent requests are made to bring the program in line with Title I concepts. Most modifications made are minor in nature, and it is a rare occasion when the loss of the program is jeopardized.

IV. EFFECT UPON EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT

A. The effect of the Title I programs upon the educational achievement of the educationally deprived children in Iowa is significant. This statement is based upon the fact that for the 1969-1970 school year, 15.5% of the total public school children enrollment were included in Title I programs. The non-public school children enrolled in Title I programs accounted for 14.3% of their total enrollment. Table I below indicates Title I participation for the public and non-public schools. The participation percentages are very similar and reveals the willingness of the public schools to work with the students of private and parochial schools.

TABLE I
Title I
PARTICIPATION OF PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC CHILDREN - 1969-70

SOURCE - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Sources	Title I Children	Total State Enrollments	% Title I Participation
Public School Children	102,777	659,888	15.5%
Non-Public School Children	11,307	79,031	14.3%
TOTALS	114,084	738,919	15.4%

With the above percentage figures representing school children who by testing, teacher observation, and economic deprivation, have been classified as achieving below their age-grade peers by one year or more the recorded achievement gains of the Title I children are significant. When this information is reviewed on the basis of the following quotation from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Teachers Manual it shows that Title I is effective:

> "Grade-equivalent scores are best suited for measuring growth from year to year. In many respects, growth is the most valuable index of a pupil's achievement that we have available. A pupil who ranks low on a test, but who shows normal or near normal gain from his previous year's record, is to be commended for his improvement. A normal or average year's growth is 10 points. Just as talented pupils should be expected to gain more than 10 points in one year, it is unreasonable to expect pupils below average in ability to achieve a full year's growth in that time."

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills measure the educational growth of children in reading comprehension, vocabulary, language skills, work-study skills, and arithmetic skills. The results for reading comprehension and the composite scores for all areas measured are indicated for Title I public and non-public school children. Tables II, III, IV, and V contrast the pre-test (January, 1969) and post-test (January, 1970) mean scores and standard deviations. The results relate to Iowa norms and are expressed in grade equivalents. Only matched pre- and post-test score results were used in this tabulation. The educational gain range was from seven months to ten months, based upon a mean score tabulation by grade level.

TABLE II

18,951 Matched Scores
Title I Children
Iowa Public Schools
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Reading Comprehension
Iowa Norms

Pre-Test - January, 1969				Post-Test, January, 1970		
Grade	Children	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Gain
4	4,776	2.5	.7	3.2	.9	.7
5	4,211	3.2	.9	4.1	1.0	.9
6	3,561	4.0	1.1	4.9	1.2	.9
7	3,641	5.3	1.6	6.0	1.9	.7
8	2,762	5.7	1.5	6.4	1.7	.7

- - - - - -

TABLE III

18,856 Matched Scores
Title I Children
Iowa Public Schools
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Composite Score
Iowa Norms

Pre-Test - January, 1969				Post-Test, January, 1970		
Grade	Children	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Gain
4	4,749	2.6	.6	3.4	.7	.8
5	4,197	3.4	.8	4.3	.7	.9
6	3,555	4.2	.9	5.0	.9	.8
7	3,621	5.3	1.7	6.1	1.0	.8
8	2,734	5.8	1.3	6.6	2.2	.8

- - - - - -

TABLE IV

1,788 Matched Scores
Title I Children
Iowa Non-Public Schools
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Reading Comprehension
Iowa Norms

Pre-Test - January, 1969				Post-Test - January, 1970		
Grade	Children	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Gain
4	607	2.6	.8	3.4	1.0	.8
5	510	3.4	1.0	4.4	1.1	1.0
6	313	4.3	1.2	5.4	1.2	1.1
7	203	5.5	1.3	6.3	1.6	.8
8	155	6.3	1.6	7.4	1.8	.9

- - - - - -

TABLE V

1,787 Matched Scores
Title I Children
Iowa Non-Public Schools
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Composite Scores
Iowa Norms

Pre-Test - January, 1969				Post-Test - January, 1970		
Grade	Children	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Gain
4	606	2.7	.7	3.6	.8	.9
5	510	3.5	.9	4.5	1.0	1.0
6	313	4.5	1.0	5.4	1.1	.9
7	203	5.6	1.2	6.5	1.4	.9
8	155	6.6	1.5	7.5	1.6	.9

- - - - - -

A t-test formula has been applied to the reading comprehension and composite scores for the public and non-public children enrolled in Title I programs. Again, this evaluates educational growth on a pre-test and post-test basis. The findings are shown in Tables VI, VII, VIII, and IX.

The computed t-test values per grade have been compared with the t-test book table of values. It has been demonstrated that the computed values obtained for each grade of public and non-public children in reading comprehension and combined composite scores exceed the book values at the 0.01 and 0.001 levels. The book values are respectively 2.576 and 3.291 at d.f., n-1 infinity.

Consequently, each value is highly significant.

TABLE VI

Matched Scores for 18,951 Title I Children
Iowa Public Schools - Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Reading Comprehension

Grade	t-Test Values	Significance
4	4.8688	Highly Significant
5	15.1975	Highly Significant
6	36.2677	Highly Significant
7	5.5567	Highly Significant
8	5.7042	Highly Significant

TABLE VII

Matched Scores for 18,856 Title I Children
Iowa Public Schools - Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Composite Score

Grade	t-Test Values	Significance
4	20.8719	Highly Significant
5	16.7841	Highly Significant
6	10.7117	Highly Significant
7	6.9542	Highly Significant
8	5.1428	Highly Significant

- - - - - -

TABLE VIII

Matched Scores for 1,785 Title I Children
Iowa Non-Public Schools - Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Reading Comprehension

Grade	t-Test Values	Significance
4	42.6049	Highly Significant
5	43.4153	Highly Significant
6	28.6077	Highly Significant
7	17.0274	Highly Significant
8	16.2337	Highly Significant

- - - - - -

TABLE IX

Matched Scores for 1,787 Title I Children
Iowa Non-Public Schools - Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Composite Score

Grade	t-Test Values	Significance
4	59.6569	Highly Significant
5	48.8532	Highly Significant
6	35.4295	Highly Significant
7	17.3347	Highly Significant
8	19.8166	Highly Significant

- - - - - -

Additional test results from the LEA's which give only a rough indication of measurable gain are included in the following tables X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, and, XVI. This rough indication is due to the manner in which the raw data was collected and in no manner is intended as a reflection on these tests. Only grades 4-8 scores are given in keeping with reported scores in Tables II-V.

- - - - - -

TABLE X

Stanford Achievement Tests
Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	158	3.3	163	4.1	.8
5	102	4.1	102	4.8	.7
6	127	4.8	129	5.7	.9
7	81	4.9	77	5.7	.8
8	103	5.9	98	6.8	.9
	571 total		569 total		

- - - - - -

TABLE XI

Metropolitan Achievement Test
Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	147	3.5	151	4.2	.7
5	115	4.2	115	5.3	1.1
6	98	4.4	99	5.7	1.3
7	36	6.0	35	6.8	.8
8	27	6.4	25	7.1	.7
	423 total		425 total		

- - - - - -

TABLE XII

Gates - MacGinitie
Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	731	3.0	716	3.9	.9
5	651	4.0	648	5.1	1.1
6	458	4.9	446	5.8	.9
7	239	5.0	241	6.1	1.1
8	86	5.6	86	6.8	1.2
	2,165 total		2,137 total		

TABLE XIII

Iowa Silent Reading Test
Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	105	3.0	105	4.5	1.5
5	72	3.9	72	5.2	1.3
6	26	4.5	26	5.2	.7
7	449	7.0	455	8.1	1.1
8	121	7.7	108	8.6	.9
	773 total		766 total		

TABLE XIV

Gates - MacGinitie
Non-Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	164	3.5	159	4.4	.9
5	126	4.2	125	5.0	.8
6	96	5.4	97	6.5	1.1
7	42	6.3	41	7.2	.9
8	23	6.6	17	8.4	1.8
	451 total		439 total		

TABLE XV

Iowa Silent Reading Test
Non-Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	---	---	---	---	---
5	---	---	---	---	---
6	7	5.0	7	6.2	1.2
7	3	5.6	3	6.5	.9
8	2	8.0	2	9.8	1.8
	12 total		12 total		

- - - - - - -

TABLE XVI

Stanford Achievement Test
Non-Public School Title I Children
Reading Score - Grade Equivalent

Grade	Number of Children	Pre-Test Mean Score	Number of Children	Post-Test Mean Score	Gain
4	2	2.7	2	3.5	.8
5	6	4.1	6	5.1	1.0
6	4	5.1	4	5.5	1.5
7	1	5.1	2	6.5	1.4
8	---	---	---	---	---
	13 total		14 total		

- - - - - - -

B. Common Characteristics of Title I Projects That Are Most Effective

According to the tabulation of the evaluation reports from the LEA's there were several characteristics commonly found which contributed to the effectiveness of the Title I projects.

Three hundred seventy (370) of the respondent LEA's reported that school personnel were more aware of the needs of disadvantaged children. Three hundred five (305) of the LEA's reported that in-service meetings were conducted to help understand the educationally deprived child and his problems. From this awareness of the problems of the educationally disadvantaged child and the meetings to understand his problems, the one most common characteristic was formulated. This is the showing of the pupil-teacher ratio, striving for a one-to-one basis as the epitome to a maximum tolerance of fifteen to one.

C. Effectiveness of Title I Projects as Related to Cost

No study has been made as to this subject, but it stands to reason that whenever the pupil-teacher ratio is reduced by forty percent or more that the cost of a program increases. Therefore, with the LEA's reporting that the Title I child needs and is receiving individual attention, in so far as possible, the only conclusion is that the effective programs cost more.

V. EFFECT OF TITLE I ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

On the State level, a Title I section was created within the Pupil Personnel Branch of the State Department of Public Instruction. This section is staffed to handle the entire Title I operation on a full-time basis. One unique feature about the Title I section is its

knack of moving across divisional lines within the Department. This is due to the broad range of Title I program activities submitted by the local educational agencies. The expertise of various personnel within the Department has been called upon many times and their advice has led to a strengthening of the programs for children on the local level.

On the local level the response to item number one of the evaluation questionnaire revealed that four hundred eighteen (418) of the four hundred forty-two (442) responding local educational agencies stated that Title I activities had created changes in the administrative and instructional staff within their schools. Seventy-five (75) schools stated they had hired administrative personnel to coordinate Title I concepts with the regular curriculum. Three hundred twenty-six (326) schools have hired additional classroom teachers, most of them in the remedial areas. One hundred ninety-two (192) schools have hired teacher aides to assist the Title I teachers. One hundred thirty-three (133) schools hired specialized personnel in the areas of health, guidance, and social work. Three hundred seventy (370) schools stated that their school personnel are now more aware of the needs of disadvantaged children.

The non-public school personnel have been in more contact with the public school personnel since the advent of Title I. There is more understanding between the two school systems. Class enrollments, test information, in-service training, sharing of specialized personnel, and sharing of equipment have all been brought about by Title I programs.

VI. ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED

Additional funding from the State level to augment Title I type activities was initiated during fiscal year seventy for educational programs for migrants. There was a $35,000 appropriation for each year of the biennium for educational programs for adult and children of adult migrant agricultural workers. There were two adult basic education programs which enrolled sixty-two (62) adult migrants. There were two elementary migrant programs with a combined enrollment of one hundred forty-two (142) children. Itinerate bi-lingual teachers were hired to work with these children in the language arts area and also to guide and assist the children's regular classroom teacher.

The Department of Public Instruction has appropriation requests included in the total Department legislative asking, but as of this time no action has been forthcoming. On the local level many of the schools have taken over certain Title I activities, as they felt all of their children should be receiving the benefit of these particular programs. Even with additional funding for fiscal year seventy, the rising costs of inflation actually meant a reduction in program funding on the Federal level and thus many of the local educational agencies have augmented their Title I allocation with local funding to continue programs they feel are helping children educationally.

A. In response to item five of the evaluation reports from the local educational agencies, the following areas of cooperation were in effect during the fiscal year seventy with the Community Action Agency

1. Pre-kindergarten project jointly funded by Title I and the Community Action Agency - 13 schools.
2. Community Action Agency sponsored Neighborhood Youth Corps projects which assisted youngsters in this project - 67 schools.
3. Community Action Agency provided funds for health services to supplement the activities of this project - 7 schools.
4. Community Action Agency provided transportation services to assist implementation of this project - 7 schools.
5. Community Action Agency assisted in determining children eligible to receive Title I benefits in this project - 51 schools.
6. Community Action Agency shared facilities or equipment with the local educational agency - 13 schools.
7. Community Action Agency provided resources to assist parents of youngsters in this project - 17 schools.

Other sources of supplementary assistance provided to Title I projects by other Federal Programs were:

1. Title II, ESEA (School Library Resources Center) - 277 schools.
2. Title III, ESEA (Innovative and Exemplary Programs) - 65 schools.
3. Title III, NDEA (Equipment and Materials for Curricular Areas) - 142 schools.
4. Title V, NDEA (Guidance Programs) - 50 schools.
5. U.S. Department of Agriculture Food Program - 109 schools.
6. Community Action Agency - 146 schools.

   (The difference between the number of schools responding to this question and question #5, which dealt specifically with the Community Action Agency, may be explained by the fact that the C.A.A., in many instances, is on a multi-county

set-up and this is confusing to the local school administrator).

7. Neighborhood Youth Corps - 114 schools.
8. Job Corps - 9 schools.
9. Welfare Administration Programs - 72 schools.
10. Title VI, ESEA (Programs for Handicapped) - 35 schools.
11. Title VIII, ESEA (Dropout Prevention) - 5 schools.

VII. TITLE I IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In Iowa, all Title I programs are operational through the public schools. They submit applications, financial reports, and evaluation reports for all Title I projects carried on within their district. Whenever a non-public school attendance center is contained within the boundary lines of a public school district, then that public school must include the non-public school in their Title I program. There were a total of three hundred forty-nine (349) Title I projects in which the non-public school children participated. The five most popular programs were:

1. Reading	116 non-public schools
2. Health Services	34 non-public schools
3. Mathematics	33 non-public schools
4. Library Services	17 non-public schools
5. Teacher Aides	13 non-public schools

The projects were distributed as to location and time of year as follows:

1. Location

a. Public Schools only	158
b. Non-Public Schools only	106
c. Neutral Premises	6
d. Both Public and Non-Public Schools	77

2. Time of Year

a. Regular School only	171
b. Summer Session only	97
c. Both Regular and Summer	71

The public school administration and the non-public school administration held joint meetings to decide the project areas in which they could work together for the benefit of the children. This planning carried throughout the program and included in-service training for non-public school personnel and participation in the final evaluation of the Title I program.

VIII. TEACHER AIDES IN TITLE I

There were two hundred sixty-nine (269) LEA's who had teacher aides that were part of the funding of a Title I program. The stipulation was made that the local education agency must agree to conduct coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs before their application was approved. There were three hundred ninety-seven (397) teacher aides employed during the regular fiscal seventy school year and four hundred twenty-six teacher aides employed during the summer. There were five hundred nineteen (519) teacher clerks employed during the regular fiscal seventy school year and two hundred twenty-five (225) teacher clerks employed during the summer.

The general pattern for teacher aides was to assist the teacher in taking care of the non-teaching duties within the classroom. The distinction between teacher aides and teacher clerks is that a teacher aide must obtain a certificate from the Department and she can then supervise children, in addition to her other duties. These duties could entail attendance record keeping, general housekeeping in the classroom, making and securing audio-visual materials and equipment for the teacher, care of the bulletin boards, typing and mimeographing various teaching materials, collection of various monies such as lunch, milk, supplies, etc., assisting the children during inclement weather with their garments; in brief, all aspects short of the actual instruction of the child.

IX. PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TITLE I PROJECTS

Slightly over half of the reporting local education agencies reported that they had additional contacts with parents through home visits. The tabulation of the reporting schools was two hundred twenty-nine (229) out of four hundred forty-two (442) responding in the above manner.

Item #13 of the evaluation report revealed that two hundred sixty-one (261) schools responded "yes" to the question: "Were parents of Title I students invited to assist in planning and/or evaluating the Title I program?" A breakdown of item thirteen shows the tabulation of the schools responding "yes" to this item.

1. Parents were invited, but they did not wish to participate - 42 schools.
2. Parents were helpful in exchanging concepts with school personnel - 196 schools.

3. Parent's concepts were totally different from those of school personnel - 2 schools.
4. Parents attended meetings, but did not contribute to the meeting - 21 schools.

Community involvement was mainly through the local service clubs. This involvement was on the basis of providing services to Title I children. These services included securing eye glasses, purchase of clothing, medical aid, including check-ups--hospitalization, immunization, and field trip activities.

Title I funds were mingled with other funds in some instances for work-study programs in the special education field. The acceptance of the community businessmen in cooperating in this type of a program is another facet of community involvement with Title I programs.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The following four schools were selected to present additional information on successful Title I activities that were included in their total Title I program. The schools and activities selected were:

Dubuque - Reading

Spencer - Reading

Audubon - Mathematics

Forest City - Non-academic Approach

TITLE I PROJECT REPORT
CORRECTIVE READING SPENCER COMMUNITY SCHOOL

1. NAME OF LEA

Spencer Community School

2. NAME, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE OF CONTACT PERSONNEL

Joe Graff
800 East 3rd Street
Spencer, Iowa 51301
Telephone: 612-262-1749

3. TITLE OF PROJECT

Helping Hand: Corrective Reading Activity

4. DATE WHEN PROJECT WAS INITIATED

Our corrective reading activity was first initiated in December of 1965. However, it operated quite differently at that time and evolved to its present form in September, 1968; since that time, we have had only a few minor modifications in the activity.

5. DATE WHEN PROJECT WAS TERMINATED

The project is being continued through FY1971.

6. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The main objective of this activity is to increase the reading ability of the participants to a level at or near the norm for their age group. For the most part, these students range from 0.5 to 2.5 years behind their norm group in reading.

Students are excused from other school activities, with the exception of reading classes, to take part in this activity. The corrective reading teachers work with the regular classroom teachers to follow-up on their students and to relay successful methods of teaching reading to the classroom teachers. A small activity room is provided in each of the elementary schools that are taking part in this ac-

tivity. Where necessary, additional lighting, chalkboard, electrical outlets, and the like have been added; however, there is still a need for better physical facilities at some of the schools.

The past two years we have had a summer activity very similar to our school year activity in corrective reading; however, unless additional funds are forthcoming, it is questionable whether or not we will operate a corrective reading program this summer.

7. SERVICES PROVIDED

Primarily only students at or below the fifth grade participate in this activity with special emphasis being placed on children at or below the third grade level. There are twenty-four classes each day with each class containing approximately five students; these classes are taught by three full-time corrective reading teachers. The classes are thirty minutes long, and all students meet five times each week. As in the past, parent-teacher conferences are held as the need arises.

The reading classes feature individualized instruction; materials such as SRA reading labs, controlled readers, reading games, work books, Hoffman's "Gold Series" program, the Phono-Viewer program, filmstrips, and the like are utilized to make the classes more interesting and meaningful. The classes are held at each individual school that is eligible to participate in the activity. Teachers visit each of the schools including the non-public school in the area.

8. PARTICIPANTS

Only students at or below the fifth grade will participate in this

activity with emphasis being placed on children at or below the third grade level. For the most part, these students range from 0.5 to 2.5 years behind their norm group in reading. Since we cannot take care of all the students who would qualify for the program, the selection process involves not only test scores, but also teacher recommendations.

- - - - - -

TABLE I

Breakdown of Corrective Reading Students for the Current Year:

Number of Students	Grade	Male	Female	School
9	2	6	3	Jefferson
6	3	5	1	Jefferson
5	4	3	2	Jefferson
11	2	9	2	Sacred Heart
10	3	7	3	Sacred Heart
10	2	8	2	Fairview
6	3	6	0	Fairview
5	4	4	1	Fairview
5	5	4	1	Fairview
4	2	4	0	North
10	3	6	4	North
3	4	3	0	North
3	4	0	3	North
6	2	4	2	Reynolds
5	3	2	3	Reynolds
5	4	3	2	Reynolds
5	5	2	3	Reynolds
11	2	6	5	Lincoln
5	3	4	1	Lincoln
6	4	4	2	Lincoln
130 Total	2nd-5th	90 Total	40 Total	

- - - - - -

9. STAFF

We have three full-time corrective reading teachers working in this activity. While only one has a degree, they are all experienced teachers, and they are all taking additional courses in education and/or reading.

Each teacher is responsible for teaching corrective reading in two elementary buildings. They teach one-half day in each school, and each teacher is responsible for approximately forty students.

The activity is under the supervision of the administrative assistant who acts as the project coordinator.

10. RELATED COMPONENTS

A staff advisory group comprised of Title I personnel involved in this project, the reading teachers, the elementary school principals, the principal of the private school, the elementary consultant for the county, and the project coordinator meet regularly to discuss the progress of the project and to suggest possible changes in the teaching methods and materials being used. Head Start personnel and parents of project children are encouraged to participate in discussions on how to better relate our program to the needs of the students involved. Each spring the advisory group evaluates the present program, makes recommendations, and outlines plans for next year's program.

The Title I coordinator meets with the superintendent of the private school in the district to discuss the general aspects of the program.

The principal of the private school meets with the staff advisory

group and is very active in contributing to the success of the corrective reading activity. Parent-teacher conferences are held at least twice a year to discuss individual pupil progress in the corrective reading activity. Suggestions and comments from the parents that are related to the activity are discussed at the staff advisory group meetings. The director of the Upper Des Moines Opportunity, Inc. Office of Economic Opportunity, is advised of the program and any questions related to the project are discussed and clarified.

The elementary consultant from the county office works with the corrective reading teachers to discuss teaching techniques and use of materials, also the county psychologist works with referral students and use is made of materials at the Area III Media Center at Emmetsburg, Iowa.

Several in-service meetings of all teachers involved either directly or indirectly with the project are planned for the coming school year. Meetings are conducted by the project coordinator. When regional or state in-service meetings or classes are held, our policy has been and will continue to be one of sending staff personnel to these meetings. Last year the reading teachers attended a regional meeting related to remedial and corrective reading.

Meetings with the Audio-Visual Director are held to discuss the use of the instructional equipment and materials to familiarize the staff with the potential offered by the various materials and machines. The teacher associate assigned part-time to this project helps the professional staff in the utilization of audio-visual equipment and materials, and in typing and duplicating instructional

materials. We are attempting to work out a program with the Iowa Lakes Community College by which we would receive help in the training of both the professional staff and the para-professional staff.

Besides the regularly scheduled meetings, informal get-togethers are held whenever some problem or question arises, and the classes are visited often by the project coordinator in an effort to help the teachers in any way possible.

11. EFFECTIVENESS

For formal evaluation the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and two forms of the Gates - MacGinitie Reading Test are given as a pre-test and post-test. In addition to this, teachers' comments and informal meetings of personnel involved in the project are used to evaluate the effectiveness of this activity.

The following is a brief excerpt from the formal evaluation of the 1969-1970 school year...

TABLE II

Gates - MacGinitie Reading

Corrective Reading*

Second Grade (51 students)	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Average
Pre-Test September, 1969	1.56	1.41	1.49
Post-Test May, 1970	2.83	2.92	2.88
Gain	1.27	1.51	1.29
Third Grade (31 students)	**Vocabulary**	**Comprehension**	**Average**
Pre-Test September, 1969	2.00	1.85	1.93
Post-Test May, 1970	3.42	3.33	3.38
Gain	1.42	1.48	1.45

(TABLE II con't.)

Fourth Grade (22 students)	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Average
Pre-Test September, 1969	3.35	2.64	3.00
Post-Test May, 1970	4.22	4.24	4.23
Gain	0.87	1.60	1.23

Fifth Grade (22 students)	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Average
Pre-Test September, 1969	4.34	4.26	4.30
Post-Test May, 1970	5.70	6.18	5.94
Gain	1.36	1.92	1.64

- - - - - -

Our experiences with the corrective reading program has indicated that the results were best when the classes were comprised of not more than five students and met every day. Thirty minutes proved to be an appropriate length for the corrective reading classes, and since the teachers were limited to eight classes per day, time was available for them to plan activities and to meet with the regular classroom teachers to discuss problems of common interest.

Using the reading comprehension score of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and using mean grade equivalent scores, the overall average was a gain of 1.09 years in reading comprehension. Once again using mean grade equivalent scores of the Gates - MacGinitie Reading Test, the overall average gain was 1.42 in reading comprehension. These are excellent results--especially when one considers that these students were well below their respective grade level in reading skills.

Even as encouraging as the tests results are, the program cannot be adequately assessed by simply taking the group's average gain as

measured on an achievement test, as many other factors enter the picture. Many students manifested very good improvement both in achievement and interest with regard to reading, and an indication of this was the large number of books that were checked out during the year. Our corrective reading activity is our oldest Title I activity and much of its success this year can be attributed to experience and perserverance, and better methods of selecting participants. Of course, equipment, audio-visual materials, supplies, and adequate physical facilities are very important. When proper materials are available many students take an active interest in reading for the first time. In teaching corrective reading, as in teaching any subject, the paramount factor in the success of the program is the teacher.

12. BUDGET

Sources:

Title I funds for corrective reading activity.....	$28,000
Funds from local school district for corrective reading activity.....	$ 8,000
Total for corrective reading activity.....	$36,000
Cost per pupil for just the corrective reading activity.....	$ 390.

If this cost were projected to cover a full day of education, the cost per pupil would be in excess of $1,500.00 a year.

MATHEMATICS LABORATORY ACTIVITY

1969 - 70

1. Audubon Community Schools

2. Donald B. Miller
High School Principal
Audubon Community Schools
Audubon, Iowa 50025
Telephone: 712-563-2607

3. TITLE OF PROJECT

Educational Opportunity Instruction for Educationally Deprived

TITLE OF ACTIVITY

Mathematics Laboratory for High School Remedial Mathematics

4. The project began in 1965 with the first full year in 1966.

5. We plan to continue this program in 1971.

6. The objectives of the program are as follows:

   1. To raise average per pupil gain 1.0 grade level on a pre-test --post-test evaluation.
   2. To prepare children to re-enter regular school mathematics program.
   3. To change the students' attitude towards mathematics.
   4. To increase the students' expectation of success in school.
   5. To raise individuals' understanding of consumer mathematics.

7. The students in our Mathematics Laboratory classes in general, receive a great deal of individualized and small group instruction. Emphasis is placed on concepts, and students will advance as concepts are developed.

   The first year students receive much of their instruction as provided by the Experimental Mathematics Program published by Central

University of Iowa, Pella, Iowa. This emphasizes presentation using a flow chart procedure.

A general mathematic book published by Laidlaw is used for reinforcing previous concepts. Additional individualized instruction is given through programmed material from Encyclopedia Brittanica and most teaching materials. Other concepts are given by using Central Iowa Low Achievers Project material for Mathematics.

First year students also used Getting Ready for Algebra, by J. Weston Walch, Publisher.

Second year laboratory students used similar techniques and materials with one addition: the students used Mathematics for Distributive Education, J. Weston Walch, Publisher, with emphasis on consumer mathematics.

The class size ranged from 5 to 18 and generally met 55 minutes per day, five days a week, for 36 weeks per year.

Most teaching machines, EDL, record players, tape recorder, film and filmstrip projectors were used to continue a multi-sensory approach to learning.

Basically all materials available and feasibly obtainable were used to provide as many opportunities for individual development as possible.

8. Students were selected based on the following criteria:
   1. Unsuccessful mathematics experiences in previous years.
   2. Ranking 1.0 grade points below expected grade level.

3. Teacher recommendation.
4. Below 50 percentile score on Iowa Algebra Aptitude.
5. Second year students based on California Mathematics Achievement results.
6. Students ranking below the 40th percentile on ITED and Iowa Basic Skills in years given.

The class enrollment for 1969-70 included one senior, three juniors, 22 sophomores, and 12 freshmen.

The lone senior was a boy while the three juniors were two girls and one boy. The sophomore class enrollees included 11 boys and 11 girls. Freshmen included 11 boys and one girl.

The freshmen students were composed of three age 14, seven age 15, two age 16, and one age 17. The sophomore enrollees had six age 15, 15 age 16, and one age 17. The juniors were all 17 and the senior 18.

The students basically are from white families, primarily culturally and economically disadvantaged in relation to the remainder of the student body.

9. All personnel involved with this activity were not funded by Title I monies.

The head of the mathematics department coordinates the learning activities. This person has a B.A. and has nearly his master's program in mathematics. During his ten years of teaching, he has attended several summer mathematics institutes as well.

The mathematics instructor of Mathematics Laboratory I is responsible for the instructional program. He has five years of experience teaching math and holds a master's degree in secondary education as of 1970.

Another person in the program is mainly responsible for Mathematics Laboratory, second year. He was a first year teacher with a B.A.

The guidance personnel, psychologist, eighth grade mathematics teacher, junior high principal, high school librarian, high school principal, and the county education consultant, play various roles in the mathematics activity ranging from recommendation, diagnosis, coordination, resources, and evaluation.

10. With cut backs in federal funds, secretarial assistance was provided by the principal's office from LEA funds. The LEA supports, through the coordinator's office, additional Multi-media educational material for the activity.

    In-service education was provided through work shops, institutes, college consultants, and consultants from the State Department, the county, and commercial institutions.

11. Each student was given the California Mathematics Achievement Test, Form X, as pre-test and Form Y, as post-test. The pre-tests were given September 2, 1969, and the post-test April 15, 1970. The normal expected gain, therefore, would be 7.5 months or .625 years gain. Nine of the ninth graders, 13 sophomores, two juniors, and the senior made gains in excess of this.

The grade equivalent gain range was as follows:

9th grade	.5 to 3.4 years gain
10th grade	.1 to 3.4 years gain
11th grade	.1 to 1.8 years gain
12th grade	.9 years gain

The average gain by grade level was as follows:

Freshmen	1.6 year growth
Sophomores	1.0 year growth
Juniors	1.2 year growth
Senior	.9 year growth

Three freshmen moved above grade level, and during 1970-71 these students enrolled as follows: one in algebra, five in mathematics laboratory II, and others will enroll in consumer mathematics or bookkeeping in 1970-71.

Four sophomores moved above grade level and during 1970-71 are enrolled in the following mathematics-oriented classes:

one math Lab I - repeat

two in consumer mathematics and Lab II

13 in math Lab II with five of these in bookkeeping

one student in general math II

four students not in any math-oriented class

one student transferred

Two juniors moved above grade level and all these are not enrolled

in math Lab II and two of these in consumer mathematics. The enrollment in new and additional elective mathematics courses indicates a change of attitude which is supported by observable attitude changes reported by the mathematics instructors during the activity. This report indicated that 20% of the 9th graders and 25% of the sophomores had improved attitudes toward mathematics. A check of first quarter grades during 1970-71 also indicates that a large majority are now maintaining satisfactory achievement in their school program.

12. As Title I funds were cut back, some LEA funds were used. The calculators used in the program were purchased in previous years activity and therefore do not show up in the budget.

ESEA funds were used for $120.00 of soft materials and the LEA spent $234.28.

Only $1,967.00 of Title I funds were used for salaries, FICA, and IPERS, and $3,063.28 was spent from LEA funds.

The 1969-70 per pupil cost of this activity was $141.70 per participant. Again this would increase if the depreciation of the calculators were figured allowing one-seventh depreciation. This would be approximately $800.00 and the per pupil cost would then be $162.84.

DUBUQUE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
1500 Locust Street
Dubuque, Iowa 52001

FISCAL 1970 ESEA, TITLE I CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

1. NAME OF LEA

Dubuque Community School District

2. NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER OF PERSON WHO CAN BE CONTACTED FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

Mrs. Ruth Hutchison
Director, ESEA, Title I Programs
Dubuque Community School District
1500 Locust Street
Dubuque, Iowa 52001
Telephone: 319-557-2905

3. TITLE OF PROJECT

Corrective Reading Project

4. DATE WHEN THE PROJECT WAS INITIATED (If the project was initiated prior to FY70 and was continued through FY70, this information should be provided).

The fiscal 1970, ESEA, Title I corrective reading project of the Dubuque Community School District is a continuation of a project initiated in fiscal 1967.

5. DATE WHEN THE PROJECT WAS TERMINATED (If the project is being continued in FY71, this information should be provided).

The fiscal 1970 project was continued in fiscal 1971.

6. OBJECTIVES OF PROJECT

The objectives should be stated specifically and must lend themselves to measurement.

To raise the reading level of those qualified participants in grades two through four commensurate with their grade level as measured by the Gates - MacGinitie Reading Test.

Goals: It is believed that participation in the ESEA corrective reading project will:

1. Aid in the development of an interest in reading which will lead to the realization that reading can be enjoyable and functional.
2. Broaden and enrich cultural backgrounds of the participants through experiences in reading.
3. Alleviate or correct certain psychological problems and negative attitudes towards self, others, and learning by being placed in a carefully planned and sequenced learning situation which assures success and progress.

7. SERVICES PROVIDED

Corrective reading centers were established at seventeen public and non-public attendance centers within eligible target areas of the school district. Each child selected to participate received, over a thirty-two week period for twenty-five minutes daily during the five day school week, specialized individual and small group instruction in reading utilizing varied and multiple materials and equipment. The maximum number of participants per group was five. Participants who satisfactorily reached a level of reading commensurate with their grade level were dropped and their places taken by other students who could profit from a true corrective reading program.

Special libraries containing challenging, attractive, and interesting books and materials commensurate with the participants' reading abilities, levels of interest, and cultural backgrounds were established in each of the reading centers.

The approach to instruction in this project was to progress from diagnosis to re-teaching, practice/application and back to diagnosis. The instruments most frequently used in diagnosis were the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, Steps in Teaching Word Attack, by Sister Alcuin, and an informal reading inventory. From the diagnosis an individual plan for each student was constructed. This plan allowed for the sequential teaching, re-teaching, and practice of sight words and word attack skills. These were then applied in carefully chosen materials written on his instructional reading level. There was also available to each participant in the ESEA center a variety of materials and equipment to support his skills practice and application as, for example, SRA kits, the Barnell-Loft series, the Merrill skilltext series, filmstrips, tape recorders, and headsets, teacher-made and purchased instructional tapes, and speech-to-print phonics program, and the Murphy-Durrell phonics practice program. Other equipment and materials such as language master machines and programs, colored transparencies, and super 8 projectors and film loops were available to the teacher on a check-out basis from the central materials center. Each child was programmed into only those materials that were pertinent to his special needs. As he progressed through the rebuilding of skills he was kept aware of his progress through

frequent planning conferences with the ESEA teacher. Continual informal diagnosis was carried on in order to keep pace with the child's real growth. In addition to his skills instruction, each child was given one class period per week in which he would be alone to read from the variety of books available to him through the ESEA library or engage in a read-along activity with a record and book. This activity was designed for the sole purpose of allowing each participant the opportunity to discover for himself that reading is a pleasurable activity.

The ESEA program of corrective instruction was carefully coordinated with that of the classroom. Not only did each ESEA teacher share her diagnosis with the classroom teacher, but she carried on regularly scheduled conferences with each teacher and cooperated in coordinating conferences conducted by the ESEA clinician.

A central materials center was established which received, cataloged, marked, stored, and circulated the materials and equipment acquired under the project. The center was under the supervision of the project director and employed a person to serve as a clerk. Transportation services were available to circulate the needed materials and equipment among the various centers.

Under the project certain psychological and health services were provided. Supplemental health services as needed were provided for the participants on a consultant basis. The nursing services of the project were integrated with the regular health program of the

public schools and were coordinated with that of the non-public schools. The director of Health Services for the district in cooperation with the project director supervised the activities and coordinated the work of the visiting nurses. The duties of the nurses included:

1. Conferring with the regular school nurses about those participants referred by teachers for needed health services.
2. Holding individual conferences with students on health matters when necessary.
3. Notifying parents of their children's health problems.
4. Making home visits with parents to encourage preventative or corrective treatment and giving advice about available community resources.
5. Cooperating with all health and welfare workers and agencies concerned with the pupils.
6. Reviewing reports of examinations by physicians, dentists, and psychologists and acting upon the recommendations within the scope of their professional competency.
7. Participating in case conferences with other professionals to discuss and decide proper courses of action.
8. Sharing information with teachers and other school personnel and interpreting screening results with them.
9. Keeping accurate and clear health records and case histories.

In performing their duties, the visiting nurses adhered to the basic principles of school nursing and remained within the bounds of their professional competence.

Children who appeared to need psychological services were referred to a psychologist retained by the county for evaluation and recommendation. Children who warranted a medical examination by a physician were so referred. Funds were made available to defray the cost of a medical examination for children from those families who were unable to pay.

8. PARTICIPANTS

The program was focused on the elementary level with preference for placement given to eligible students enrolled in grades two, three, and four in that research has shown that reading programs can be more effectively and quickly corrected in the lower elementary grades.

In the spring of 1969, the first, second, and third graders in each of the target area schools were administered screening tests. The Gates - MacGinitie, Primary A-Form One was used in grade one. The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test was used in grades two and three. From the results of these tests, I.Q. scores, and teacher judgment, candidates and alternates for the following fall's program were chosen with preference given to those children who manifested the ability to profit from a true corrective reading program. The final decision as to which students would be selected was made by the respective building principals in conjunction with the project director and clinician. As a result of this screening, 160 second graders, 162 third graders, and 69 fourth graders were chosen as official participants for the 1969-1970 program. Sixty-four percent of the total group were boys.

9. STAFF

The project director, who possessed an MA in reading, was responsible for implementing, supervising, and evaluating the project. A clinician, who also possessed an MA in reading, assisted the director in the general operation of the project to include clinical diagnosis of reading problems and coordination of the ESEA corrective reading program with that of the regular classroom.

The equivalent of fifteen full-time teachers who had the necessary training, experience, enthusiasm, and interest were secured to staff the project. Each professional staff member was required to meet the appropriate certification and approval standards established by the State Department of Public Instruction. Three half-time visiting nurses were also secured to provide supplemental health services.

10. RELATED COMPONENTS

Under the direction of the project director, in-service training was provided for members of the corrective reading staff during the school year. In-service training for the visiting nurses was provided by the Director of Health Services. In all cases such training focuses not only on the general overall needs of each staff, but also on the individual needs of each staff member. The services of outside consultants was also secured to assist in this training. Funds were made available for tuition reimbursement up to $150.00 per teacher for those teachers who from September 1, 1969 to August 31, 1970, took approved graduate credit courses directly related to their assignment. It is believed that such an in-service program coupled

with adequate supervision has resulted in improved performance on the part of the project staff.

The planning, operation, and evaluation of such a comprehensive educational program as ESEA, Title I requires, by necessity, the involvement of many different interests within a community. This means the involvement not only of administrators, school specialists, and classroom teachers from the public and non-public school systems, but also of parents and representatives of other community organizations which have a genuine and continuing interest in the development of the children to be served under the program. Such interests were represented on a Local Advisory Committee for Compensatory Educational Programs formed by the district to aid in the planning, operation, and evaluation of its ESEA, Title I project.

Parental involvement of the participants in the project is important and was accomplished in a number of ways. First, some parents were informed of the exact nature and objectives of the project as well as of the progress of their child within the project. This was done through written communications, special meetings, and periodic parent-teacher conferences in the home, at school, and by telephone. If it was determined that a child was in need of psychological, medical, or other special services, the parents were informed by the visiting nurses who, through home visits, encouraged preventative or corrective treatment and gave advice about available community resources. Further, if it was determined that a family was in need of special services, referrals were made to various community agencies.

11. EFFECTIVENESS

A continuous evaluation of all phases of the project was conducted. This included an evaluation of each participant through objective and subjective means. In order to meet the federal requirements for "appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement" the following standardized reading tests were administered to each participant at the beginning and conclusion of his participation in the project:

1.	Grade two	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	Primary B, Forms 1 and 2
2.	Grade three	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	Primary C, Forms 1 and 2
3.	Grade four	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	Primary D, Forms 1M and 2M

In addition to the internal evaluation procedures, an external evaluation was performed at the district's request by two reading authorities from the College of Education of the University of Iowa. Their report is attached.

Achievement gain as evidenced by comparing months in the program with the number of months progress indicates that during the eight month program, 80% of the 160 second graders made at least an eight month gain, 66% made at least one year's gain, and 47% reached grade level or above. In the third grade, 78% of the 162 participants improved by at least eight months, 62% by at least one year, while 28% reached grade level or above. Of the 69 fourth graders, 67% improved by at least eight months, 51% improved by at least one year, and 17% reached grade level or above. An analysis of the average reading deficit

for each grade in October and the average gain in months for the eight month program appears in Table I.

Another means of determining significant growth is suggested in the technical manual of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. If a group has taken two forms of the same test at different times, it is important to determine whether the gain made over the period of time has been significant. The technical manual for the tests gives values that can be used to assess the significance of differences between two scores for the same group on the same subtest, taken at two different times within a given grade. These values should be divided by the square root of the number of children in the group to determine the minimum standard score differences that may be considered significant. Take, for example, the collective scores of the second grade participants reported in Table II. The one hundred sixty (160) participants obtained a mean standard score of 53.0 in October on the Primary B Vocabulary test. When retested in May with the other form of the test, this same group obtained a mean standard score of 57.0 when the raw scores were interpreted according to the October norms. Thus, when judged by the same norms, this group gained 4.0 standard score points. This is a significant gain, for according to the technical manual, a gain of only .59 points would be significant. This figure is derived by taking a value for computing minimum significant differences from the technical manual (7.4) and dividing it by the square root of the number of participants, (12.6). An analysis of the mean standard scores for the tests administered in October and May for grades two, three, and four

appears in Tables II, III, and IV respectively.

While the scores obtained by the participants on standardized reading tests give some indication of accomplishment in achieving some of the goals of the project, it is important that information from other sources be used. Informal reading inventories and anecdotal records used by the teachers showed, in most cases, progress in reading. Also evidenced was an improved interest in reading as well as improved attitudes toward school. Information on the progress of each participant was made available to school officials, regular classroom teachers, and parents.

12. BUDGET

The cost of the corrective reading project was entirely underwritten with federal funds appropriated for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This amounted to $121,363 for fiscal 1970, at an average per pupil cost of $310.39.

TABLE I

Grade	No. of Part.	Avg. Deficit in October	Avg. gain in May	8+ month gr. pre- & post-	1+ year gr. pre- & post-	+Grade level
2	160	-.5	1.1	80%	66%	47%
3	162	-.7	1.1	78%	62%	28%
4	69	-.9	.9	67%	51%	17%

TABLE II

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test - Primary B

Second Grade
160 Participants

Mean Standard Scores:

October test -- October norms

Vocabulary	53.0
Comprehension	46.0

May test -- October norms

Vocabulary	57.0
Comprehension	58.0

Gain in Standard Score Points:

Vocabulary

4.0 (57.0 - 53.0)

Comprehension

12.0 (58.0 - 46.0)

Gain Needed to be Significant:

Vocabulary

.59 (7.4 ÷ 12.6)

Comprehension

.71 (8.9 ÷ 12.6)

- - - - - -

TABLE III

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test - Primary C

Third Grade
162 Participants

Mean Standard Scores:

October test -- October norms		May test -- October norms	
Vocabulary	44.0	Vocabulary	54.0
Comprehension	44.0	Comprehension	53.0

Gain in Standard Score Points:

Vocabulary	Comprehension
10.0 (54.0 - 44.0)	9.0 (53.0 - 44.0)

Gain Needed to be Significant:

Vocabulary	Comprehension
.62 (7.9 ÷ 12.7)	.58 (7.4 ÷ 12.7)

TABLE IV

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test - Primary D

Fourth Grade
69 Participants

Mean Standard Scores:

October test - October norms		May test -- October norms	
Vocabulary	44.0	Vocabulary	51.0
Comprehension	47.0	Comprehension	50.0

Gain in Standard Score Points:

Vocabulary	Comprehension
7.0 (51.0 - 44.0)	3.0 (50.0 - 47.0)

Gain Needed to be Significant:

Vocabulary	Comprehension
.95 (7.9 ÷ 8.3)	1.02 (8.5 ÷ 8.3)

DUBUQUE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

An Evaluation Of

The Corrective Reading And Enrichment Projects

1969-1970

Evaluators:

Dr. Jack Bagford

Dr. William Curtis

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

ESEA PROGRAMS

DUBUQUE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

It is significant to recognize the limitations of the evaluators to succinctly gain insights of a total program with only four days of observation in the program. Keep in mind that our comments are directed to you in order that you might build an even stronger involvement with children so that they may accomplish the task of learning to read. It is encouraging to note that your program has been in operation for the past three years when "The Right to Read" was not the vogue that it has developed into during the past year.

An analysis of the reading program as it has existed during the 1969-1970 school year has led us to the conclusion that it is (1) administratively sound, (2) educationally beneficial, and (3) personally gratifying to both students and staff.

When one takes an objective broad overview of the Corrective Reading and Enrichment Programs in the Dubuque Public Schools, he must conclude that they are outstanding programs. Acting within the guidelines established by the State Department of Public Instruction, they have spent the federal money appropriated to them in a manner calculated to produce high returns per dollar spent.

The program has selected children with great personal and reading needs and has placed them in a setting where they can be relatively successful. Children are being given a chance to meet regularly with teachers who care about their reading problems. Together they work at activities which

are appropriately suited to the child's needs. These children are growing substantially in their ability to read and to cope with problems in their daily life which threaten to overwhelm them.

The aura of professionalism that resides with the staff of this program is probably one of its most gratifying features. Children are not mere pawns in an educational exercise to increase grade level performance, but human beings with problems in the environmental framework in which they must function. Here, in your program, we have found teachers who listen to children's problems, attempt to analyze the nature of the problem, and then put into practice some operative measures that will alleviate or correct the problem. This refers to social as well as educational dilemmas, and in consideration of the nature of the program, both spheres are equally significant.

Whenever contact was made with school administrators outside the program, a feeling of complete support was given to the nature of the enterprise, even though specific aspects might be questioned. The one resounding comment was, "the children benefit" and therefore we (the evaluators) assume that if the major consideration of the program continues to be "The Child" the program will continue to serve its purpose. You seem to have built this into your program via interaction with classroom teachers, nurses, principals, administrators, parents and children. If this aspect of your program is maintained and expanded it should help to allow even greater future success.

SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS

With a strong feeling that there is already a high quality program in

Dubuque, we would like to suggest some direction for possible improvement. The suggestions do not necessarily imply weaknesses, but in a way are offered for moving from what is now great strength of personnel and program to greater strength. Some suggestions will be general in nature while others will be very specific. In any case, all are meant to be suggestions. We would encourage the personnel connected with the E.S.E.A. programs to study the suggestions carefully and to make such changes in program that they deem necessary. It would be presumptuous of the evaluators to attempt to tell you, who wrestle with the problems day after day, what they must do.

SUGGESTIONS INCLUDE:

1. The evaluators view reading as a humanizing process. From reading, persons should come to know more about themselves, about their world and the ways in which they relate to it. Through reading, students should grow as human beings. It is recognized that to be able to use reading in this manner one must acquire a certain amount of skill in recognizing words and combinations of words in print and comprehending what they say, and in the process they must enjoy what they are doing. But it is our view that this must be done in the larger context of the child's life. He is a living, growing person and we think his activities in reading must take this into account.

   Specifically applied to the Dubuque programs, we think that the skill aspects of reading, particularly the word recognition skills are overemphasized. We believe that there should be more emphasis upon comprehension, more emphasis upon reading as an enjoyable

process, and more emphasis upon reading as a humanizing process. This is not to imply a lacking of these aspects in the program now, but rather it is a matter of emphasis. We would like the teachers to be more interested in their students as people; we would like to see more concrete life experiences; we would like to see more stories being told and more reading to the students by the teachers; and we would like to see more genuine praise for student successes.

2. A second aspect which needs some thought and possible refinement is in the area of communication. The programs at Dubuque are good; more people need to know about them in greater depth. But beyond the public relations aspects of communication, the program needs its story told so that it can be more effective. We suggest such things as:

   A. The director should write and distribute to all concerned a weekly newsletter. The newsletter should be sent to teachers (both E.S.E.A. and others concerned), principals, superintendents and other pertinent administrative personnel, and to such parents and community leaders that seem appropriate. Its aims should be to coordinate, to inform, to instruct, and to produce an identify and esprit de corps.

   B. E.S.E.A. teachers should communicate more with the teachers in their own schools. They should strive to visit classrooms so that they can know their students in another setting. Possibly they could have their students publish

a simple weekly paper to inform the teacher about activities in the E.S.E.A. room. Time should be found when the teachers (classroom and E.S.E.A.) could regularly visit with one another on an informal basis. The E.S.E.A. teachers should find ways of being together informally, possibly eating lunch together regularly. In general, we are saying, every opportunity for formal and informal communication must be utilized. Much more could be done without taking too much precious time from other activities.

3. Consideration should be given to the idea of extending the programs to include more pupils. One idea might be to move pupils in and out of the program more frequently (if and when this is appropriate). In some cases, the children should be subjectively entered into the program during the first grade as it becomes obvious that they have a need for E.S.E.A. service. Students should also be tested at levels above those you think they can master. Too often we underestimate the students capabilities, because of their past performance. Into the program early and out of it early should be a guideline.

It is recognized that a certain amount of money can only be spent once and that choices do have to be made. Nevertheless, we suggest a continual rethinking of who is in the program and who should be. Possibly the E.S.E.A. staff should lead a fight to extend the program to all schools in the city. Certainly there

are students in non-target areas who have needs similar to those included in the program. If federal money is well spent in target schools, maybe local funds should be used for similar programs in non-target schools.

4. The testing program to date seems much too cumbersome and extensive for the benefits derived from it. Evaluation and diagnosis are certainly a needed part of any reading program, but we sense that Dubuque's program is too formal and too time consuming. Over one month was spent in identifying the child's level of performance and this still needed constant modification during the year. We would encourage in the direction of less rigidity and formality.

Specifically, we would try to have the students selected and placed in the teaching phase of the program quicker in the fall, even at the expense of making some mistakes. Mistakes could be reassigned.

We think a self-concept test is a necessary part of the program, but we would dispose of the one being presently used and obtain another, possibly giving thought to developing one of your own. If personal development is a goal of the program, you need to have data to support this phase.

With regard to testing done by school psychologists, we would say that it should be continued in a limited fashion. Only those students with problems beyond the scope of the E.S.E.A. staff

and teachers should be tested extensively. When such students are tested, the psychologists should feel free to make specific suggestions about a plan of action, but the E.S.E.A. staff and teachers should take them as suggestions only and should feel free to modify the plan of action as they deem appropriate. The quality of the E.S.E.A. personnel is high; they understand people and problems; thus, they should not feel hesitant about using their own good judgment after all data are collected. This is the purpose of collecting data.

One area that seems to be receiving more attention by the school psychologists that it warrants is in the area of perceptual development. Research in this area is at best tenuous, thus, large expenditures of time in this area should be avoided unless definitive results can be seen. Deficiencies in perceptual development should not be used as an excuse for lack of progress when, in fact, the problem may well have been poor instruction or some other outside influence.

Totally, we are suggesting that you use less time for the formal testing. At the same time we would not like to see less evaluation. We merely suggest that evaluation can be more informal, daily, continuous and thoughtful.

5. Materials were in abundance as we viewed the program. It was noted that differentiated teaching styles resulted in more prominent use of certain materials over others. Although one might suggest that materials be assigned to teachers according to their

particular style, we would suggest that the availability of materials should encourage teachers to vary their approaches to suit the learning styles of the children.

If possible, we think ways should be found to extend the use of materials in the regular classroom and into the home. We would like to see more high interest--low vocabulary materials and we would like to see more fun reading available to the students. We simply ask the question, "Can more books, films, filmstrips, pictures, oral reading by teacher, field trips, etc., be used to a greater extent to foster the pupils' growth?"

6. Where possible the effect of the E.S.E.A. program should be extended into the home. From our limited contact with the nurses and their work, we think they are doing a tremendous job on an insurmountable task. We would like to see other avenues of home contact explored. For example, where possible, teachers should extend their contacts with parents. Communication by phone and letter should be encouraged. Occasional home visits are possible. Parents days at school should be more frequent. Parents should be encouraged to communicate their feelings about the program or about their child to E.S.E.A. teachers.

In making these suggestions, we recognize the time problem and we would not want to encourage an over expenditure of time on such ventures. Rather our suggestions are one of emphasis. We would like to see all personnel be more aware of the daily

possibilities of home contact and utilize them to the children's benefit where possible.

7. Pleasant atmosphere is also a key to your success. In each room we found the teacher and students, sometimes severly limited by space, attempting to encourage a sense of relaxing work-study. It is through the warmth of the teachers that this was most apparent, yet the classroom can and should reflect the teacher's concern for her charges. Efforts should be made to keep the environment bright and cheerful, relaxed, not repressive but controlled, stimulating, and emotionally warm. Continued use of extrinsic motivation is to be desired when intrinsic motivation is not possible, but care should be taken so that competition doesn't develop between children. In these circumstances, the only justifiable competition is that occurring when a person strives to be better than he was yesterday. Wherever possible, rooms should be arranged to provide a place for a reader to read without being disturbed by others.

8. The concept of reading error is not a good one if we truly believe that all reading response is cued response. Therefore, an attempt should be made to investigate the concept of "miscues" as a means of identifying the reading problems of children. Dr. K. Goodman from Wayne State University might be a good consultant for an in-service workshop in this area. Teachers should be encouraged to look upon "mistakes" as "miscues" rather than errors.

9. In the administration of the program, care should be taken to

delineate various functions. Everybody's job should be as well defined as possible. The accounting procedures should be delineated from the instructional program with clear-cut lines of responsibility drawn. The instructional program should not rely on the accounting techniques of the program, and the accounting aspects should not interfere with the instructional program.

It is understood that certain federal and state guidelines must be followed, but often the spirit of the law is a better guideline than the letter of the law. Generally speaking, any funding agency would want money allocated to buy as good a program as possible. To buy the best possible program, the local agent sometimes must act within the spirit of the guidelines rather than the letter of the guidelines. Such advice is not meant to encourage unlawful expenditure of money. Rather, it is to encourage the wise local use of money so that it buys the best program possible for the greatest number of children possible.

We would like to conclude by saying that we think you are doing an excellent job. We would like to encourage you to extend your capabilities and your influence wherever possible. "The Right to Read" is becoming a reality in Dubuque.

1. NAME OF LEA

Forest City Community School

2. NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER OF PERSON WHO CAN BE CONTACTED FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

Craig J. Downing
Superintendent of Schools
Forest City, Iowa
Telephone: 582-2323

3. TITLE OF PROJECT

"The Group"

This project was terminated May 30, 1970. A similar project is being initiated through VISTA and will start in December of 1970.

On March 3, 1970, an experimental project at the Forest City, Iowa Junior High School was started. The project was to help seven disinterested and non-motivated ninth grade boys.

To overcome negative attitudes and to give them a more constructive way of solving their problems, it was decided to remove them from the traditional classroom. This class was to operate with the following objectives:

1. To develop in the student the ability to communicate in an effective, rational manner.
2. To investigate in depth topics and vocations which are of interest to each of the students.
3. To help the student take steps toward becoming a responsible student who realizes the value of school.
4. To help the student understand himself and realize his worth.

5. To begin to develop in this student a positive attitude toward society.
6. To help this student to become accepted by the community.

With these objectives as the framework, the class was started. Two rooms above a furniture store were rented for a classroom. The first group project was to clean and paint the rooms. The instructor observed the students as they worked. Decorating the room gave them a feeling of pride and responsibility for its care.

The school day was divided into two phases. During the morning the boys worked at jobs of their own choice. The following kinds of work was done:

1. Auto mechanics helper
2. Auto parts clerk
3. Gas station attendant
4. Veterinary helper
5. Aid at the retarded children's school
6. Carpenter at a trailer factory

This work experience enabled the boys to receive instruction on the job and to help them decide if they were really interested in a particular type of work. Some of the boys did find they were not interested in the work they had chosen.

Instead of working every morning, two boys attended classes at Waldorf College. One attended a class in social problems and the other attended an industrial arts class. These boys were attentive and

interested in the classes and presented absolutely no problems.

The group attended their own classes from 1:00 to 3:30 p.m. each day. Classwork was informal and group dynamics were used as a teaching device. Classes began with a "gripe and praise". This included friendship, trust, honest, smoking, drinking, drugs, personal problems, and school problems.

In conjunction with this, lay people and other students were asked to take part in their discussions. By talking and asking questions of teachers, policemen, pastors, and businessmen, they got to hear about various vocations and were able to understand and appreciate their problems better. By talking to students, they discovered that they had similar problems and they learned that people should be treated as individuals not as groups. A big brother program was started, using young men from Waldorf College. Each student had a helper in whom he could confide and discuss questions on a one-to-one basis.

The participants were all ninth grade boys of average or below average achievement. They were disenchanted with school and had histories of classroom disturbances, drop-out tendencies, and non-involvement in academic work and activities. Some of the boys were also problems in the community. They were stealing, fighting, drinking, and carrying on other socially unacceptable activities. Each of these boys had family environmental problems which were the causes of many of their troubles.

Al Kuehnast was employed as the advisor-teacher. He graduated from Waldorf College in 1960 and received his Bachelor of Science degree in education from Drake University in January, 1970. He majored in social science and minored in sociology.

Before the program was started, an advisory committee was established. The membership was composed of the school superintendent, principal, school psychologist, three teachers, and a veterinarian who participated in the work program. The committee met regularly to discuss problems and to give the instructor directions. The parents of the boys were also consulted and home visits were made.

After three months, progress was observed in the attitudes, the actions, and the overt behavior of the boys. There was improvement in their ability to communicate with others. They became more pleasant and it was easier to work with them. They developed a sense of pride and worth. They seemed to understand that to better themselves, they had to participate in a constructive way in their school and in their community. At the conclusion of the year, we felt we were going in the right direction, but much work needs to be done before these people can take their place in community life.